

ATTACHMENT 2

HIGH VOLUME OF FINALISTS SCORING METHOD ILLUSTRATION ASSUMING TOTAL AVAILABLE BOARD POINTS OF 400 AND TOTAL AVAILABLE TECHNICAL/FEE SCORE OF 400

| | CANDIDATE 1 | CANDIDATE 2 | CANDIDATE 3 | CANDIDATE 4 | CANDIDATE 5 | CANDIDATE 6 |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Tech Score | 210 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| Fee Score | 50 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Board Score | 400 | 333 | 266 | 199 | 133 | 66 |
| Total Score | 660 | 733 | 666 | 599 | 533 | 466 |
| | | | | | | |

The Boards first choice (Candidate 1) would NOT be selected. The incremental difference is small and therefore the Boards influence is diluted.

Total of 6 Finalists: Under current policy, the 400 Board points would be divided by six (for the number of finalists), thereby providing a difference of 66.66 points between each bidder.

Candidate 1 – lowest technical passing score; cost twice as much as lowest bidder; ranked #1 by Board

Candidate 2 – highest technical passing score, highest fee score, ranked #2 by Board

Candidate 3 – highest technical points; highest fee score; ranked #3 by Board

Candidate 4 – highest technical points; highest fee score; ranked #4 by Board

Candidate 5 – highest technical points; highest fee score; ranked #5 by Board

Candidate 6 – highest technical points; highest fee score; ranked #6 by Board

ATTACHMENT 2

LOW VOLUME OF FINALISTS SCORING METHOD ILLUSTRATION ASSUMING TOTAL AVAILABLE BOARD POINTS OF 400 AND TOTAL AVAILABLE TECHNICAL/FEE SCORE OF 400

| | CANDIDATE 1 | CANDIDATE 2 |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Tech Score | 210 | 300 |
| Fee Score | 50 | 100 |
| Board Score | 400 | 200 |
| Total Score | 660 | 600 |
| | | |

The Boards first choice (Candidate 1) would always be selected. The incremental difference is much greater and therefore the Boards influence is greater.

Total of 2 Finalists: Under current policy, the 400 Board points would be divided by two (for the number of finalists), thereby providing a difference of 200 points between each bidder.

Candidate 1 – lowest technical passing score; cost twice as much as lowest bidder; ranked #1 by Board

Candidate 2 – highest technical passing score, highest fee score, ranked #2 by Board